

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI**

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA**

**V.**

**NO. 1:23-CR-99**

**TARIQ WILLIAMS**

**ORDER**

On January 8, 2024, Tariq Williams moved to dismiss the Indictment, Doc. #31, and then moved to withdraw his “erroneous filing” of the January 8 motion to dismiss the Indictment, Doc. #32 at 1. According to Williams, the motion to withdraw is unopposed by the government. *Id.*

Upon consideration,<sup>1</sup> the motion to withdraw [32] is **GRANTED**. The January 8 motion to dismiss [31]<sup>2</sup> is **TERMINATED**.

**SO ORDERED**, this 11th day of January, 2024.

**/s/Debra M. Brown**  
**UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE**

---

<sup>1</sup> Williams filed an earlier motion to dismiss the Indictment on September 14, 2023, which is still pending. Doc. #17. The Court denied Williams’ January 4, 2024, motion to dismiss the Indictment—which was substantially identical to the September 14 motion to dismiss—as “untimely since it was filed after the dispositive motions deadline and because Williams ha[d] not sought an extension of the dispositive motions deadline or leave to file the January 4 motion to dismiss after the deadline.” Doc. #29 at PageID 85.

<sup>2</sup> Williams asks to “withdraw the Motion to Dismiss Indictment filed on January 8, 2024, docket entry 30.” Doc. #32 at 1. But the January 8 motion to dismiss is docket entry 31. And docket entry 30 is Williams’ motion to continue. The Court presumes Williams’ motion to withdraw intended to reference docket entry 31; however, if such presumption is inaccurate, Williams’ counsel should notify the Court immediately.